1 (Case called)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Counsel, please state your appearances for the record.

MR. CAPONE: Russell Capone for the government. With me at counsel table are AUSAs Lauren Schorr and Kan Nawaday.

Good afternoon, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. FINKEL: Good afternoon, your Honor. Richard

A. Finkel, counsel for Mr. Lichtenstein, who is standing next
to me, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. Please be seated.

MR. FINKEL: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: We're here for the sentencing of Mr. Lichtenstein. Let me inform counsel of the materials that I have. Counsel, let me know if I'm missing anything.

I have the presentence report prepared on December 22 and revised on March 8 -- it says 2016, but it's March 8 of 2017 -- along with the addendum and the sentencing recommendation by the probation department of 57 months' incarceration on a guideline range of 57 to 71 months.

In addition, I have the 67-page presentence memorandum of Mr. Finkel dated March 2, along with a series of attachments, Exhibits 1 through 11. I have the government's sentencing memorandum filed on March 9.

I have a letter from Mr. Finkel also dated March 9

1 which has attached Exhibits 12 through 23. I have a separate 2 binder of letters in support of the sentencing requests of Alex 3 Lichtenstein. There are approximately 120 letters. I have a 4 letter dated March 12 from the government, and I have a letter from Mr. Finkel dated March 9. 5 Mr. Finkel, is there any additional written 6 7 information I should have that I don't? 8 MR. FINKEL: No, your Honor. You have them all. 9 THE COURT: Mr. Capone? 10 MR. CAPONE: Nothing else, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Mr. Finkel, have you and Mr. Lichtenstein 12 had a full opportunity to read and discuss with each other the 13 presentence report, the recommendation, the addendum, and all 14 the materials that I have in front of me? 15 MR. FINKEL: Yes, we have, your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Have you in fact read and discussed it 17 with your client? 18 MR. FINKEL: Absolutely, your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Do either you or your client have any 20 objections to the findings of fact in the presentence report? 21 MR. FINKEL: Yes, we do, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: What are they, sir? 2.3 MR. FINKEL: With regard to paragraph 74, your Honor, 24 my objection is noted --

THE COURT: Let me just take a look at it. I note

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

It's actually the reverse of that. The statement that Mr. Lichtenstein made that is consistent --

THE COURT: He drinks daily except on the Sabbath.

That's what you're saying?

MR. FINKEL: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: There are a number of references to that

in the materials.

Mr. Capone, I don't have any objection to changing that.

What's the position of the government?

MR. CAPONE: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Then I will change paragraph 74. I'll delete the phrase "approximately once a week" and insert "six days a week" so that that paragraph will read, "According to the Samaritan Village outpatient intake interview conducted on June 21, 2016, the defendant indicated that he drinks six days a week when he drinks about half to one bottle of liquor. The defendant acknowledged drinking while at work. An assessment of alcohol use disorder severe was given."

So I've adopted your objection to paragraph 74. What else?

MR. FINKEL: Thank you. That's all, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does the government have any objections to the findings of fact in the presentence report?

MR. CAPONE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Then I adopt the findings of fact in the presentence report with the correction that I've made in regard to paragraph 74. I'm going to return all of this information to the probation department at the end of the sentencing proceeding today.

Mr. Finkel, let me hear from you. Actually, before I

do that, I have a question for the government because it's a little unclear to me how much money was involved, how many permits were involved, how much money the government believes the defendant made out of this bribery scheme.

Specifically, as I understand it, the record evidence is that he charged individuals who wanted gun licenses approximately \$10,000 each but up to \$18,000. It looks like at least Officer Villanueva was given I think the evidence is up to \$1,000, which would, therefore, yield anywhere from \$9,000 to \$17,000 for Mr. Lichtenstein's pocket; but it's also unclear how many licenses he bribed the police department to handle.

We know that when he was stymied in his efforts to use the same policeman he had been bribing, he sought somebody else ought, and he told him he could expect to make \$900,000 a year it was, if I remember; that the policeman would get \$6,000 times 150 licenses would be about \$900,000 a year.

Now, that doesn't mean that actually happened, given the fact he was trying to entice somebody into his bribery scheme. It may not have been the truth, but I guess my question to the government is: What are we talking about in dollars here and number of licenses, to the extent the government knows? Indeed in the plea agreement, the defendant consented to a forfeiture of \$230,000.

Speak to me, government.

MR. CAPONE: Your Honor, there is a distinction

between licenses that we have identified, specific applicants that Mr. Lichtenstein put forward and that we can trace to him, and his statements and other evidence about how many applicants there were that we haven't necessarily identified. That may explain some of the differences in the numbers that we agreed on in the plea agreement as opposed to what Mr. Lichtenstein has said.

THE COURT: That's why I said he may have been pumping the number that he was actually handling in order to entice somebody else into the scheme.

MR. CAPONE: Yes. But the plea agreement is a loss of \$150,000 to \$250,000. That's based on what we've agreed on in terms of the value of the licenses. I think it's somewhere between 25 and 50 licenses that we have identified. It may have been more, but for purposes of what we agreed upon in the plea agreement, 25 or 50 licenses would represent \$150,000 to \$250,000 value.

THE COURT: Where did the value of those licenses come from?

MR. CAPONE: The value of the licenses was based on what was being charged for them by either Mr. Lichtenstein or expeditors. Expeditors charged less money. So it's the value of a gun license to somebody seeking a gun license through an expeditor in New York City.

THE COURT: It's not the value of the license. It is

1 | the value of the market cost to use an expeditor.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MR. CAPONE: Yes, your Honor. It's what people will pay for a license.

THE COURT: For which there was no requirement.

MR. CAPONE: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.

MR. CAPONE: So I think we're talking about between 20 and 50 identified licenses. It may have been more. Obviously Mr. Lichtenstein bragged about more, but for purposes of this sentencing, I think that's the number the Court should use, and that's what was established in the investigation and the discovery.

THE COURT: What about how much money he put into his pocket?

MR. CAPONE: He put into his pocket, we believe, at least \$230,000.

THE COURT: Hence the forfeiture amount.

MR. CAPONE: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: He agreed to that?

MR. CAPONE: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Finkel, let me hear from you, sir. I'm here to listen to whatever you want to say. Obviously I'll hear from Mr. Lichtenstein as well.

Let me help guide your presentation. You're free to

do whatever you like in the presentation, but I can tell you a couple of things. It's a nonstarter to argue that

Mr. Lichtenstein should not go to prison. He's going to go to prison; that is, from my standpoint it's a nonstarter.

The crime is so extensive, and the corruption of the New York City Police Department is so important to avoid, and in a way, it seems to be a bit pervasive within the licensing division, based on this testimony, that primarily for purposes of general deterrence but also punishment, a prison sentence is appropriate here.

Now, again, you can make whatever arguments you want. That's my starting point. As of now, the man is going to go to prison. The real issue, the real play in the joints, is where within the guideline range he should go to prison. That's one point. Again, do with that what you wish.

The second point is you spent almost all of your 60 some odd pages talking about the good works Mr. Lichtenstein has done and precious little telling me about the crime.

From my standpoint, I have absolutely no doubt that Mr. Lichtenstein is tremendously generous and has done a great number of charitable things, no question. I can assure you that I have read, not skimmed, read, every one of the approximately 120 letters. I've read, not skimmed, all of the other material here.

So I am fully aware of just the wonderful, pervasive,

charitable activities he has engaged in. You don't really have to tell me about them. You can if you want, but you don't have to convince me.

People are complicated, and along with this charitable side, obviously Mr. Lichtenstein has pled to a serious federal felony in which, as I say, he was corrupting the New York Police Department.

My job is to try to do what's reasonable and appropriate and sufficient but not greater than necessary under the law using all of the factors that you're aware of in 18 U.S. Code, Section 3553, including the history and characteristics of the defendant and the crime.

Again, I repeat. I'm fully convinced he is very charitable. Now, it happens it looks like a lot of his charity was using the cash derived from his illegal bribery scheme, but his charitable efforts cannot be denied.

Proceed, sir.

2.3

MR. FINKEL: Thank you, your Honor. Mr. Lichtenstein and I understand that he's convicted. He admits to the bribery that you just described, your Honor. There's no question as to that. He understands the serious nature of the charge as you've just expressed it as well, your Honor.

I will add that his guilty plea, his admissions before your Honor, are only a small part of his acceptance of the responsibility for those crimes.

2.3

May I add to that that all the people here,
your Honor, and the people that didn't get into the courtroom
and are in another courtroom understand that Mr. Lichtenstein
admitted to bribery. This is not a case, they understand,
where he challenged the government and lost at a trial. They
understand he admitted to bribery.

They understand that and that he did the bribery because Mr. Lichtenstein personally told them, all of them, and many others. They all understand the very serious nature of the charge itself.

But they all came here to demonstrate that they know Mr. Lichtenstein from the other side that you mentioned also, your Honor. They all are beneficiaries of his good works, his charity, all of them. Sometimes they worked with him to benefit people, but many, many, probably almost all of them, are direct beneficiaries of his work.

As you pointed out, your Honor, Section 3553 instructs us to consider the history and characteristics of the defendant. Most respectfully --

THE COURT: As well as the crime.

MR. FINKEL: As well as the crime. Yes, your Honor.

Most respectfully I would suggest to the Court that the
government in its presentence memo doesn't follow that dictate.

They say -- and I quote from their presentence memo -- that the line of credit that the charitable acts should not be

considered "a line of credit that he can redeem for a lesser prison sentence."

I think that's a great sentence from a literary standpoint, but if it means that the charitable good works of Mr. Lichtenstein should not be considered by your Honor --

THE COURT: Whether it means that or not, I am going to consider his charitable works.

MR. FINKEL: Thank you, your Honor. That's the first point that I want to make.

May I add to that --

2.3

THE COURT: The charitable works -- obviously I know you'll agree -- or I assume you will -- don't wipe out the crime.

MR. FINKEL: We are not suggesting that they do, your Honor, not for a moment. We understand that the sentencing decision that you're going to make is a difficult one.

Sentencing is, from my perspective, more so difficult in this case, because of the exceptional and extraordinary nature of what Shaya Lichtenstein did on the good side, on the good works side, to balance against the crime that he admits that he committed.

THE COURT: It's fair to say, although it's not clear in the record, that the man throughout this period, which was 2013 to 2016, was awash in unreported cash. I think it's safe

to infer that he was taking the money that he got from his customers for his illegal bribery scheme and distributing it in his charitable efforts.

MR. FINKEL: Into where, your Honor?

THE COURT: His charity.

MR. FINKEL: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: His charitable efforts.

MR. FINKEL: Yes, your Honor. That, to be sure, did happen. Yes. That's correct.

I want to add to that, if I may. What you just said is not, as the government suggests, an effort by us to characterize the bribery as an example of, to use the word that the government uses, the "propensity" of Mr. Lichtenstein towards charity. They're separate. We are not suggesting that.

We are not suggesting that the money that he took from his clients with regard to the gun licensing and then gave to charity lessens the crime. We are not. They're separate. One side is the crime, and the other side is the good works. They are separate, and we recognize that.

The government also says -- and the word they use is "confounded" -- that they are confounded that we submitted photographs as exhibits, and several of those photographs have police officers in the photographs.

Mr. Lichtenstein understands that he committed a

2.3

serious crime, but one of the facts of this case -- not one, but a fact in this case is that Mr. Lichtenstein had a relationship with the police department. That is a fact. Part of that relationship was a crime, the bribery. That is another fact.

But separate and apart from that is a third fact, that he worked with the police department, he assisted the police department, he got assistance from the police department, and he worked separate and apart from the police department for his good works, to the benefit of the city of New York, to the benefit of his community in Brooklyn.

THE COURT: I don't disagree with you. It's a balancing issue.

MR. FINKEL: I'm sorry, your Honor?

THE COURT: It's a balancing issue.

MR. FINKEL: Yes, your Honor. That's exactly what I said a moment ago.

So I'm not confounded with regard to the use of those photographs. Those photographs are not tied to the bribery in any respect.

THE COURT: I think Villanueva is in one or more of the photographs.

MR. FINKEL: No, he's not, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. FINKEL: He's not.

1 THE COURT: Okay.

2.3

MR. FINKEL: Those photographs are photographs of the good works that Mr. Lichtenstein did, for example, in conducting searches for missing people. They were with other police officers where he was coordinating searches. They're separate and apart from the bribery. They have nothing to do with the bribery.

We ask your Honor to consider all these works as part of the history and characteristics of the defendant, of this defendant.

THE COURT: I'm going to.

MR. FINKEL: Charity and good works is a relative term, at least I consider it to be. Mr. Lichtenstein's actions were truly extraordinary. That's what the people here are here to demonstrate to the Court.

THE COURT: And you agree with me so was his crime.

MR. FINKEL: Yes. His crime was a very serious crime, your Honor. I do agree with that. I might add -- and your Honor probably doesn't know that -- I was a prosecutor for ten years, and I prosecuted some official corruption cases. So I understand that. It is a serious crime.

THE COURT: It hindered the services of the New York

Police Department to do their jobs and to protect the people of
the city from wrongdoers, but he was subverting that by bribing
police officers to issue various gun licenses, various levels

of gun licenses, without the required due diligence. He was lessening the faith of the people of the city of New York in their own police department. That goes beyond Mr. Lichtenstein.

Go ahead.

MR. FINKEL: Most respectfully, your Honor, I don't believe it's that simple. It takes two to tango, as they say. So, to the extent that the government suggests --

THE COURT: He's not the only defendant in this indictment.

MR. FINKEL: Yes, your Honor. I understand that. To the extent that the government suggests that it's

Mr. Lichtenstein who corrupted the police department, I don't agree with that at all, because it does take two to tango.

There was a bribe giver and a bribe receiver.

THE COURT: When he ran out of the old, reliable bribe receivers, he tried to hunt up a new one. In fact, when he met with the new potential bribe receiver, he said, are you wearing a wire? He said, in words -- I don't have the exact -- I'd rather be meeting you in your underwear.

Since you're a prosecutor of official corruption, you know what that means. He was concerned that the potential new bribe receiver who turned him down was wearing a wire.

So it looks like he's, at least in this one instance, pretty much the initiator of the bribe. I don't think I have

to worry too much about who initiated it. It does take a bribe giver and a bribe receiver. There's no question about that.

MR. FINKEL: The police officer to whom you refer, your Honor, had a longtime relationship with Mr. Lichtenstein. This was not their first meeting, not by any stretch. They had a very longtime and close relationship.

THE COURT: He was using his good and true relationships with the police. I think in his plea allocution he said something like a good and friendly relationship.

Indeed he did because as a member of the Shomrim, he had a lot of opportunity to work and to assist the New York Police Department. But at least in terms of his bribery scheme, he's using, he's leveraging, he's corrupting those good and true relationships with the police in order to commit a crime and line his own pocket.

MR. FINKEL: Your Honor, again, most respectfully, it takes two to tango.

THE COURT: I agree.

MR. FINKEL: If these police officers were truly corrupted -- let me back up half a step.

It's not that they were corrupted. It's that they were already interested and willing to accept a payment.

THE COURT: Not the man I'm talking about who turned him down.

MR. FINKEL: I'm talking about a larger number of

1 people here.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

THE COURT: Yes, there were police officers who accepted payment. That's correct.

MR. FINKEL: When the government fully investigates the case, they may well learn something quite different about the police officer who wore the wire because of the nature of his longterm relationship with people.

THE COURT: What is your point here? It takes two to tango.

MR. FINKEL: It takes two to tango.

THE COURT: I have no problem with that concept.

MR. FINKEL: So my point here is that it's not as if Mr. Lichtenstein dragged these police officers kicking and screaming to get them do something.

THE COURT: That's correct. He bribed them with cash, up to \$18,000.

MR. FINKEL: No.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. That was how much he charged.

Yes. We don't know exactly --

MR. FINKEL: That only occurred on one occasion, \$18,000.

THE COURT: No. The \$18,000 was what he charged a customer.

MR. FINKEL: A customer. Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: He bribed them with money. That's what --

MR. FINKEL: That's what he admitted to. Yes, your Honor. Yes, he did.

2.3

THE COURT: There's also evidence, according to the government, in addition to cash, there were a variety of other perquisites given to the police.

MR. FINKEL: Yes, your Honor. That's not the entirety of Mr. Lichtenstein. As you point out, 3553 instructs us to consider his history and characteristics, and his history and characteristics are exemplified by the 120 letters that your Honor read that we submitted.

And the people here today, as some of them wrote in their letters, viewed Mr. Lichtenstein, not knowing about the bribery, as a hero. Several of the letters actually use that word.

THE COURT: Many, one or more, also call him "rabbi," a term of great respect.

MR. FINKEL: Yes, your Honor. That is also true. But you'll notice, I used the word "viewed" Mr. Lichtenstein as a hero, past tense, because he's not on that pedestal, as you point out, the respect when you use the term "rabbi." He's no longer on that pedestal.

They no longer look at him that way, and he no longer feels that way because his life has changed because he is no longer the role model that he once was or once was perceived to be. He's off that pedestal. People don't come to him anymore

for advice and for help. He doesn't have that anymore.

These people who are here now and the others who are not here that wrote letters and many beyond those all know that. It's very widely known, particularly in this orthodox community in New York, because Mr. Lichtenstein is still a very well-known person, no longer a well-respected person by any means.

But, your Honor, when your Honor looks at the guideline calculation level 25, as your Honor well knows, there's not part of that calculation that subtracts or adds levels for good works. The guidelines don't consider good works at all.

Therefore, I would respectfully submit to your Honor that the guideline calculation, the level 25, and the guideline range, 57 to 71, is not appropriate here.

THE COURT: You've reserved the right to argue that in your plea agreement which he agreed to. I understand that.

MR. FINKEL: That's what I want to argue, your Honor.

THE COURT: Again, it's a balancing because you can't possibly be arguing that if somebody commits a crime but also does good works, that wipes out the crime. It just isn't so.

MR. FINKEL: I'm not suggesting that. You've said that before, and I agree with that again. I'm not suggesting it. I'll use the phrase we both used a few moments ago. It's a balancing. You have on one side the nature of the crime,

serious, and the other side the nature of his good works, extraordinary.

THE COURT: In terms of general deterrence, it's a dangerous argument because you would not want to argue -- nor would I want to accept an argument -- that as long as you do good works, you get, as it were -- I don't mean this literally -- dollar-for-dollar credit and, therefore, because everybody knows about the crime and everybody knows he's done good works, let's call it even Steven. You're not arguing that, and, as I say, I wouldn't accept it. But how do you draw the line?

MR. FINKEL: Yes, your Honor. If I may paraphrase, it's not a get-out-of-jail-free card. It's not.

THE COURT: That's exactly what your 60 some odd pages argue, a nonincarceratory sentence.

MR. FINKEL: Your Honor, what I'm saying to you now is what we said just now, that it's a balancing. The guidelines, the calculation under the guidelines law, does not include good works at all. There's no subtraction for good works.

As your Honor well knows, there are subtractions for a host of different reasons — a major player, a minor participant. There are many subtractions in the guidelines calculations. There is no entry whatsoever for good works, no consideration.

Because there's no consideration whatsoever for good

2.3

works, I would submit to the Court that the guideline recommendation -- and that's what it is now, a recommendation -- cannot be applicable because it doesn't consider one of the factors -- and the factor that I'm pressing today that is included in 3553 -- and that's good works.

If the guidelines had a section for good works and a 5-point deduction, a 10-point deduction, a 12-point deduction, I could not make that argument because then the guidelines result would somehow incorporate good works, but the guidelines are absent entirely for good works.

Therefore, any calculation under the guidelines cannot apply to a person like Shaya Lichtenstein who did good works and certainly cannot apply to a person like Shaya Lichtenstein who was extraordinary in his good works because it's not a consideration.

And that's a failure of the guidelines, but it doesn't bind Your Honor because your Honor has the authority, since Booker, to render a nonguideline sentence, and that's what we're asking, a nonguideline sentence.

But as I'm trying to persuade your Honor most respectfully, the starting point must be below the guidelines because the guidelines don't consider these factors.

Mr. Lichtenstein is not someone who just was a nice guy, who wrote checks during the year to a host of charities. He didn't do that. As your Honor knows because you read our

sentencing memo and the letters in support, he did a lot more.

I want to go into some of those now because the people who wrote the letters and the people who were involved are here. They didn't just write letters. They came here to demonstrate the sincerity that they saw in Mr. Lichtenstein and the great efforts that they saw in Mr. Lichtenstein.

THE COURT: You can do that. You don't have to. I've accepted that he undertook each of the charitable efforts that are outlined in the 120 letters. I have every reason to believe he was sincere in that charity. I have every reason to believe the people who received the charity, many of whom received it anonymously at the time it was given, are extremely appreciative. That's not at issue here.

Again, do what you want, but that's not at issue. I can recite, probably as well as you can, the incidents that were set forth, perhaps not as well as you can, but from the New Hampshire search to the chartered plane to get the remains in the Grand Canyon to the finding the young ladies in Arizona to the anonymous donations for schooling to the wiping out of food bills at holiday times. I understand those. I have no doubt of his sincerity.

I question how this all came about since he was using, one presumes, illegally obtained funds, but was he giving charity to people who needed it? Absolutely. It raises all kinds of issues.

For example, where is his personal financial statement? Paragraph 85 says he never gave it. I'm sure there are good reasons he never gave it, but I'm going to require, as a special condition of supervised release, that he provide all required financial information.

He pays two mortgages on what appears to be a very nice house as well as an -- I don't know whether it's an apartment. I think it's an apartment -- in Brooklyn. He has five cars that he leases. He has a driver at \$1,500 a week, according to this information.

If you do add up his expenses, his expenses for just those -- mortgages, cars, and a driver -- add up to more than he reports on his income tax. It raises all kinds of issues. He's not being sentenced for income tax fraud here, but there's that in your information as well.

MR. FINKEL: Your Honor started that discussion with New Hampshire. Let me just step from there. In the courtroom today is the woman whose husband died in the forest in New Hampshire. She married a grand rabbi --

THE COURT: And the grand rabbi stood up when Mr. Lichtenstein came into the room which the letter says was a most unusual mark of respect, and she said, why are you doing this? He explained what a special person Mr. Lichtenstein was. I don't question any of that.

MR. FINKEL: She came from Montreal for one reason,

your Honor, to be here today. She had no other business in New York. She came because she knows how important Mr. Lichtenstein was to her.

You mentioned the girls who ran away to Arizona. Frimchy Hirsch is here today also with her husband. In the picture we submitted there's a third woman.

THE COURT: And in the letter she's talking about how she's married, how she has a wonderful family, and how Mr. Lichtenstein helped her understand the situation she found herself in, and I remember the pictures of her.

Go ahead.

2.3

MR. FINKEL: That picture, you'll recall, has a third woman who was a teacher who was close to the girls who worked with Mr. Lichtenstein to get them resettled, and Esther is here as well.

THE COURT: Welcome to everybody who is here.

MR. FINKEL: And Frimchy Hirsch's sister who also wrote a letter to the Court who remained orthodox, Beila Jakobovits, is here.

THE COURT: Everybody is here, and the support of each and every one of you is appreciated. It shows how much Mr. Lichtenstein has meant to you.

I'm not quite sure why you're going down this road when I've told you I accept all of that.

MR. FINKEL: Your Honor, I would like to do that

2.3

because I think it demonstrates the extent to which

Mr. Lichtenstein helped people. As I point out in my

memorandum, he didn't just conduct a search or help somebody

and walk away with other first responders.

THE COURT: He stayed with the people, and he talked to them, and he even did it in the alcohol rehabilitation program. The last four or five letters are from people -- my guess is from the names at least -- are not members of the orthodox Jewish community, but he was of a great help to them in the 28-day alcohol program in Florida, and he stayed with them from the very beginning and since and has given them great comfort.

MR. FINKEL: I don't wish to try your Honor's patience. So, rather than continue down that course, I will just assure your Honor that the people in this courtroom are many of the people who wrote the letters, almost all of the people who wrote the letters, that you've referred to.

There are members of the Shomrim here, including the men who ran following Shaya Lichtenstein to ground zero. There are members of Hatzalah here, sort of the sister organization.

THE COURT: I'm familiar with them. They run the ambulances; right?

MR. FINKEL: Yes, your Honor. They're all here. All these people are here --

THE COURT: The record should reflect that individuals

were standing up as Mr. Finkel referred to Shomrim and Hatzalah, and the 911 rescue.

2.3

MR. FINKEL: Thank you. Many of the other

letter-writers are here -- people who had cancer, the woman who gave birth to a child with Down syndrome -- she's here as well. The people who he counseled through divorce proceedings, which is a very difficult thing in the orthodox community, men and women -- they're here as well. Mr. Feldman, whose daughter was in the other search, in the Massachusetts forest -- Mr. Feldman is here. It was not easy for them to come here.

The woman, Ms. Weissman, who was assaulted with her daughter -- she's here as well. They're all here, your Honor.

THE COURT: He worked with them and the police and scoured the neighborhood to obtain private security films to assist in what ultimately turned out to be the successful capture of the assailant.

MR. FINKEL: Yes, your Honor. For all these reasons, your Honor, although he committed a serious crime,

Mr. Lichtenstein is not that person only. Mr. Lichtenstein did much good for many people and the city of New York and the United States, and the sentence needs to reflect both sides of him.

THE COURT: I don't disagree with that.

MR. FINKEL: So, in making the balance, your Honor, we ask you to consider the good as well as the not good, as well

as the bad. In making that decision, to understand that the guidelines range is a calculation that does not include any good, and there is a ton of good here to be considered.

Therefore, we -- "we," me, Mr. Lichtenstein, his brothers and sisters that are here -- his father is here -- and all the people that he helped -- all have the same request.

They request understanding and leniency from the Court.

Mr. Lichtenstein's middle son is here. He shouldn't be here today. His wife just gave birth to a little boy.

THE COURT: Very nice. Congratulations.

Congratulations, sir.

MR. FINKEL: He should be at home with his wife and the baby. He's here worrying about his father. He should be home planning the bris for next week. He's here with his father. They are all here requesting the Court's understanding and leniency, and that's what we request, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. I appreciate your remarks. I'm not sure that there's much that you said that I disagree with in terms of I obviously need to balance the good with the bad. Just as in your papers though, you focus primarily on the good and don't really explain the bad. I understand your comments, sir, very much.

Mr. Lichtenstein, you have the right to address the Court, sir. You don't have to say anything, but you do have the right to speak to the Court. I do need to tell you or want

to tell you that anything you say can be used against you, but I'm here to listen to whatever you want to say, if anything, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I have destroyed my life.

I have hurt the people that mean the most to me -- my wife, my children, grandchildren, my parents. I was respected in the community. People came to me for advice and for help. All that has ended. I worked hard with Shomrim.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. I didn't hear that last bit.

THE DEFENDANT: I worked hard for Shomrim so that people would rely on Shomrim for help, and the many projects I did through Shomrim increased Shomrim's reputation. Shomrim was respected. Now my acts have hurt Shomrim. I have poisoned its relationship with the NYPD.

When I was a child, I learned what it was like not to have. I tried to help people so they wouldn't suffer the way my family did. I worked with Shomrim to help make the city safe, to help people in danger, but I broke the law.

When people called me for help, when the police asked me for help, I came running. My family got used to me running out to help at all hours of the day and night. When I helped people, I always did it with heart. I tried to help and comfort.

I was proud of my help to many people. I made terrible mistakes. I know that. I'm very, very sorry for my

mistakes, and I'm disgraced by these mistakes and by having to be here.

Over the years, I became an alcoholic. I drank from waking up to going to sleep and often in the middle of the night. It affected my brain and added to my present problem, but because of this case, I have been to rehab, and I'm trying very hard not to drink again.

My life was helping people. My life is my family. I pray and ask that your Honor allow me to continue both, and I'm so very, very sorry to all the people who relied on me -- the Shomrim, the police, your Honor, and especially my family.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. I know that was difficult for you.

Let me ask you a question, sir. If you think you can say and answer, do so. If you don't want to, you don't have to.

Why did you commit this crime?

THE DEFENDANT: Originally the people came to me asking me to help them out with licenses, and the truth of the matter is I did it originally without asking anything, without asking any money. Later on it became something that I became busy with, and -- may I ask something?

THE COURT: You can talk to your lawyer at any point, sir.

(Pause)

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. So I did start charging money, and it went from little to more and more.

THE COURT: But you were using this criminal scheme to fund, in significant, if not the entire part, the charitable activities. It doesn't make sense to me. It doesn't compute.

THE DEFENDANT: My intention was first to help the people.

THE COURT: Again, I've told you anything you say could be used against you. You don't have to respond, and your lawyer is putting a hand on your arm.

Mr. Finkel, go ahead.

MR. FINKEL: Your Honor, you make an important point.

That is that he didn't take all this money that he made and buy elaborate things for himself.

THE COURT: He certainly did. He has two homes. He has a very nice home which he couldn't possibly afford on the amount of money that he reports in income taxes for adjusted gross income. He gives away tens of thousands of dollars in charity. As I've said, he leases five cars for his family members and himself. He certainly did.

MR. FINKEL: Your Honor, one of the homes is really not -- he never paid for it, and we tried to point that out in our paperwork, and it's reflected in the probation report.

THE COURT: You're going down a dangerous path here, sir.

2.3

MR. FINKEL: Yes. I understand that, your Honor.

THE COURT: You're certainly entitled to, but let me point out in regard to the home he supposedly doesn't own, in paragraph 86, it states that the second mortgage he has is for a condominium at 200 Wallabout Street, Brooklyn, in which his uncle Leo has resided.

The property was initially purchased with Lichtenstein Family Trust funds in October 2009. That's what apparently you and your client told the probation department.

Now, it's a hard argument, sir, for you to make that when Mr. Lichtenstein's father had 11 children living in a one-bedroom apartment and then moving to a two- or three-bedroom where many children all lived in the same bedroom and his father worked impoverished at a hardware store, that his brother Leo was the recipient of Lichtenstein Family Trust funds from Mr. Lichtenstein's great grandfather.

MR. FINKEL: That's what happened, your Honor.

THE COURT: That's the inference that you're asking me to make, that of 11 children, one received family trust funds to buy an apartment and the other one was left completely impoverished.

MR. FINKEL: The facts are a little different than that because Leo Lichtenstein and Shaya Lichtenstein's father are brothers, and the trust fund money came from their father, Leo's father, who is also the grandfather of Shaya

- Lichtenstein. That's where the trust fund came. The funds were made available after the great grandfather, the grandfather, passed away, your Honor. They were not available earlier.
 - THE COURT: Mr. Lichtenstein's father still is impoverished, according to the presentence report.
 - MR. FINKEL: His father. Yes, your Honor.
 - THE COURT: That's right. Again, you want me to think one son was showered with trust funds and the other one wasn't.

 Correct?
- MR. FINKEL: No, your Honor.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

- THE COURT: Explain it again. One son is Leo; the other son is this defendant's father.
- MR. FINKEL: Yes, your Honor.
- THE COURT: One son, Leo, is given trust funds. The other son of 11 is left impoverished. That's what you want me to infer.
- 18 MR. FINKEL: The 11 children -- Mr. Lichtenstein is
 19 one of 11. There were --
- THE COURT: I'm sorry. You are quite right. You're quite right.
- 22 MR. FINKEL: That doesn't change your Honor's point.
- THE COURT: No, it doesn't.
- MR. FINKEL: I understand that, your Honor. I understand that. That is what happened here, your Honor.

That's what I can tell you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

THE COURT: Do you want to argue that

Mr. Lichtenstein's standard of living is supported by the amount he reports on his income tax?

MR. FINKEL: Mr. Lichtenstein's business in the last year has, since his arrest, collapsed substantially, more than half. So Mr. Lichtenstein is in difficult financial stress right now, your Honor. That I can say to you.

THE COURT: Again, that's not the main thrust here.

MR. FINKEL: That's correct.

THE COURT: The main thrust is the crime lessened by his good works. Thank you, Mr. Finkel.

Mr. Capone, what did you want to say on behalf of the government?

You heard the defense argument, which is in essence — and I haven't disagreed with the facts — the argument is look at all the people who are here. Read all the letters. I don't doubt that Mr. Lichtenstein did everything these letters say he did.

Mr. Finkel seemed to think I had an issue with that.

I don't. Mr. Finkel 's argument is that forgives a great deal.

He doesn't really want to talk about the crime.

What do you want to tell me, government?

MR. CAPONE: Thank you, your Honor.

I'll start with that. I don't dispute either that

Mr. Lichtenstein has done a number of charitable and good things. It makes sense that Mr. Finkel is highlighting them, and I agree that it's appropriate for the Court to consider them.

THE COURT: I must say I've seen a lot of people who have done charitable things. Mr. Lichtenstein seems really to have devoted himself to those charitable enterprises, using, one can infer, the fruits of the crime. But, nonetheless, he devotes himself to charitable works.

MR. CAPONE: Yes, and he was a member of the Shomrim for quite some time, but I don't know that it's as simple as the guidelines don't take this into account, and the guidelines shouldn't because I don't think you can just, for example, give the defendant a 2-point departure because he has done a number of good things. You would not be able to do that because every person is different, and you need context.

Part of the context here is that he's done a number of good things, but part of it is also that that is balanced here against not a one-time crime, not something that happened over a brief time period or that did not lead to significant profit, and it's not as if this is a crime that he committed in the past and/or then rehabilitated himself. This is a crime that went on over a period of years at the same time as he was doing some of these good deeds. It's a crime that earned him considerable profit.

2.3

The other context that's important is that a lot of what the defendant was able to do was because of his relationship with law enforcement. Most of these good works are related to law enforcement efforts.

One thing I tried to highlight in the government's supplemental letter is that his relationship with the police department -- it's a relationship he highlighted in pleading guilty -- is based, at least in significant part, on money.

It's not just the money he was paying his two codefendants in this case who have also been charged and who are in the licensing division, but it's money that he was spreading to other police officers throughout Brooklyn, including high-ranking officers.

He made a significant habit of giving money and gifts to the police. He kept detailed records of this. I have some of them right here. There are more than 100 entries of payments to or things bought for police officers, largely in Brooklyn, some of the same officers that he worked with.

He cultivated a relationship with them that was based, at least in significant part, on the money that he was giving to them or the gifts that he was buying for them. Part of that relationship was used for good for sure.

When I say context matters, I don't think that the sentence the Court imposes should sanction that behavior or should give him significant credit for the good works he was

2.3

able to do through law enforcement when some of that was predicated on a relationship based on graft with law enforcement. So I think that undercuts not all but a good part of Mr. Finkel 's argument.

To the Court's belief that a lot of what he was making from this effort he was putting back into his charitable efforts, I'm sure that some of that is true. He obviously spent money on some of those efforts. Some of this money came from this. Some of it came from his other business.

There's certainly an element of greed here beyond charity. He was charging people thousands upon thousands of dollars for relatively simple work, and it was made more simple by the fact that he had guaranteed or near guaranteed success. If it was really just based on trying to help people, when he was stopped in December of 2015, he would have cut his losses, your Honor, and found other ways to help people.

He did not. He went back and tried to find other officers that he could bribe so he could keep making money. So charity is part of the context here, part of his motivation, but there is a larger context here, your Honor. That's what I would say with respect to the balancing of his good works, which are relevant but I think need to be placed in context.

I don't think I need to spend much time on the seriousness of the offense. Your Honor clearly understands that this offense significantly abused the public's trust in

the police and in a very important function of the police.

That's gun safety.

2.3

Put simply, people were getting gun licenses because the defendant was paying for them and because people in the NYPD were selling payment. That's a frightening prospect, that you can buy gun licenses, that people in New York City can be awarded gun licenses not based on merit, not based on law enforcement diligence and evaluation, but based on their ability to pay. It wasn't a crime that was limited in scope. It wasn't a crime that was limited in time.

THE COURT: I take it you have no evidence that any of the guns whose licenses Mr. Lichtenstein bought, as it were, through corrupting the police officers were used in any crimes.

MR. CAPONE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Apart from the fact that due diligence apparently wasn't done, what examples are there of licenses that were issued that shouldn't have been issued or the level of the license was inappropriate, given the facts of the application?

MR. CAPONE: The licenses in many instances were issued for individuals to be able to carry weapons around the city concealed.

THE COURT: Rather than a premises license?

MR. CAPONE: Yes, your Honor. In the normal exercise of diligence, the police department would probe as to the

legitimate need for people to carry weapons around the city.

These are individuals who would not have earned carry permits.

In addition, one of the things that happened was

Mr. Lichtenstein and Mr. Villanueva would have somebody apply

first for a premises license, which is easier to get and easier

to justify. There would be a minimal amount of diligence done.

Then it was easier for Mr. Villanueva, once they had a premises license, without asking for any documentation or support, to simply to go in the computer and upgrade it. So that happened on a number of instances.

People with criminal histories were approved. In at least one instance, an individual with a felony conviction was approved, which is an automatic bar and should never have happened.

In other instances, people with misdemeanors, including weapons-based misdemeanors, were approved. These are individuals who technically could have been approved. It is not a legal bar, but based on our investigation and discussions in the licensing division, typically would have faced a significant hurdle in getting gun licenses, or people with domestic violence or other similar issues.

So, no. We don't have an indication of a crime that any of these weapons were used in, but there is ample evidence of people that shouldn't have gotten gun licenses under normal standards of getting them. I think if we were here with

evidence of criminal activity that occurred as a result of this crime, we'd be talking about a different guidelines range altogether.

Just briefly on deterrence, your Honor, there is a good opportunity for the Court to generally deter this conduct in this case in New York City. The licensing division, which is just a block away here, is relatively small. It's finite. There are a limited number of officers in that division.

THE COURT: I think general deterrence, the primary factor in my mind, using specific deterrence -- I don't think Mr. Lichtenstein is bound to do this again, especially if he continues on his path of sobriety.

By that comment, I don't mean to suggest his alcoholism made him do this. It certainly did not. He was certainly able to function in a somewhat sophisticated criminal scheme, even while being what he says is a functioning alcoholic in his papers.

But the general deterrence is both for the police and for other members of the public, not limited to the orthodox

Jewish community in Brooklyn who might think about betraying the public trust by bribing police officers. That's true.

There is a punishment aspect here, but the main driver, I think, is general deterrence.

MR. CAPONE: I agree, your Honor. Just to respond to one additional point that you and Mr. Finkel spoke about, and

that is any potential difference between Mr. Lichtenstein and the NYPD officials or the notion that it takes two.

It is the case that in some respects it is the public official who has a sworn duty, that has taken an oath, and to some degree, there is more reprehensibility there.

Of course, from a guidelines perspective, that's why public officials start higher. So we'd be talking about a higher --

THE COURT: Not much higher.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MR. CAPONE: Not much higher, but we'd be talking about a higher range.

THE COURT: Is it 2 points to start?

MR. CAPONE: Two points higher. Yes, your Honor.

Here, of course, although Mr. Lichtenstein isn't the public official, he is the person making the most money out of this scheme, and he is, as to the second more recent bribe at least, the initiator of it. That may be something of a wash, your Honor.

THE COURT: That's the bribe in Count Four; right?

MR. CAPONE: Yes, your Honor.

Your Honor, unless you have any additional questions, I will rest on my submission.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Finkel, is there anything you wanted to say?

MR. FINKEL: Nothing further. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Finkel, somebody is raising their hand. Do you want to see what it is.

Talk to your father's lawyer. Talk to the lawyer, sir, first.

Mr. Finkel?

MR. FINKEL: Nothing further, your Honor.

THE COURT: This is not an easy sentence. As I've said before, Mr. Lichtenstein has led a life of a great deal of charitable works, but he has also committed a serious crime. He's betrayed the public trust by bribing and corrupting New York City police officers.

He's quite lucky, in terms of sentencing, that none of the licenses for guns in which he was able to subvert the process were used in criminal wrongdoing, to which the government is able to find out, because the sentence certainly would have been higher had that been the case. I'm still perplexed by what led Mr. Lichtenstein to do this. I'm not sure I'll ever understand it.

I came in fully expecting to impose a guideline sentence. I'm going to go under the guidelines here. The agreed-upon guidelines are 57 to 71 months. In the agreed-upon plea agreement, Mr. Finkel did reserve the right to argue for a variance below the guidelines, and I think in this instance, due to Mr. Lichtenstein's good works, a below-guideline sentence is appropriate. But the need for general deterrence

is extremely important here, both from the standpoint of the police and from the standpoint of other people in the community.

My intention is to sentence this defendant to 32 months' incarceration on each count to be served concurrently, two years' supervised release on each count, a fine of \$20,000 to be paid in four quarterly installments beginning March 31, a forfeiture of \$230,000, and a special assessment of \$200, and the standard mandatory and special conditions of supervised release that are recommended by the probation department.

Before I formally impose sentence, Mr. Finkel, did you wish to make any formal objections?

MR. FINKEL: I have several requests. No objections, your Honor.

THE COURT: If it's sentencing requests, we'll handle it after I've imposed sentence.

Government, any objections?

MR. CAPONE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Lichtenstein, please stand, and I will impose sentence.

I hereby find that the total offense level is 25, the criminal history category is I, the guideline range is 57 to 71 months.

Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, it is the judgment of this Court that the defendant, Alex Shaya

Lichtenstein, is hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of 32 months on each count to be served concurrently.

Upon release from imprisonment, Mr. Lichtenstein shall be placed on supervised release for a term of two years on each count to be served concurrently with the conditions recommended by the probation department, namely, the following mandatory conditions:

One, he shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime. Two, he shall not illegally possess a controlled substance. Three, he shall not possess a firearm, dangerous weapon, or destructive device. Four, he shall refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance.

He shall submit to one drug test within 15 days of placement on supervised release and at least two unscheduled drug tests thereafter as directed by his probation officer. He shall cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by his probation officer.

He also shall comply with standard conditions 1 through 13 plus the following special conditions:

Mr. Lichtenstein shall participate in an outpatient treatment program approved by the United States probation officer, which program may include testing to determine whether he has reverted to using drugs or alcohol.

He must contribute to the cost of services rendered in

the form of third-party payments based on his ability to pay and the availability of third-party payments.

I authorize the release of available alcohol treatment evaluations and reports, including the presentence investigation report, to his alcohol abuse treatment provider.

Two, he must provide his probation officer with access to all requested financial information.

Three, he must file his income tax returns in a timely fashion.

Four, he must not incur new credit charges or open additional lines of credit without the approval of his probation officer unless he is in compliance with the installment payment schedule that I'm going to impose.

I hereby order Mr. Lichtenstein to pay to the United States a special assessment of \$200 which is due immediately. I am imposing a fine of \$20,000.

If the defendant is engaged in a BOP non-UNICOR program, he must pay \$25 per quarter toward the criminal financial penalties, and if he participates in the BOP's UNICOR program as a grade 1 through 4, the defendant must pay 50 percent of his monthly UNICOR earnings toward the criminal financial penalties consistent with BOP regulations at 28 C.F.R. 545-11.

I'm going to change my statement that the \$20,000 fine is due in four quarterly installments beginning March 31.

Instead I'm going to impose a sentence of the fine being paid in monthly installments of 15 percent of his gross monthly income over the period of supervision to commence 30 days after his release from custody.

MR. FINKEL: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Within 72 hours of release from the custody of the Bureau of Prisons, Mr. Lichtenstein shall report in person to the probation office in the district in which he is released. I'm not imposing restitution, because there's no victim, pursuant to 18 U.S. Code, Section 3663.

I am imposing a forfeiture of \$230,000 as agreed upon in the plea agreement. That forfeiture shall be included in the judgment.

In the special condition of supervised release in which I require that the probation officer be given access to all requested financial information, I am directing that Mr. Lichtenstein fill out and affirm a personal financial statement on a periodic basis and give it to his probation officer. The frequency will be determined by his probation officer.

I understand my authority under Booker, Fan Fan, Gall, and the other cases that Mr. Finkel referred to at the beginning of his remarks. I understand that the guidelines are advisory only.

I have sentenced this defendant below the guideline

range, significantly below the guideline range, and less than what I was intending to sentence him when I entered the courtroom today.

I have considered all of the factors in Title 18, U.S. Code, Section 3553(a). I believe the sentence is appropriate, reasonable, and sufficient but not greater than necessary to meet the ends of the criminal justice system. I don't have to restate it again.

Mr. Lichtenstein, you've participated in corrupting the New York City Police Department. You had to have willing participants. That I understand, but it's not as if you just sat back and let things happen. You actively tried to find police officers who would accept bribes, and you were concerned about being found out. You wanted to make sure at least one wasn't wearing a wire.

You undermined the trust of the public and the

New York City Police, and you did it over a number of years.

You betrayed your friends in the New York Police Department.

You betrayed your friends in Shomrim. You betrayed the members of your community who you helped over the years, and it's a shame.

You haven't ruined your life though. You said you ruined your life. You'll be able to continue good deeds, sir. Not with money that you've illegally obtained, but both in prison and when you leave, you'll be able to continue a life of

1 good deeds, and I urge you to do so.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Mr. Finkel, are you aware of any reason whatsoever why the sentence should not be imposed as I have stated it?

MR. FINKEL: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Capone?

MR. CAPONE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: I hereby order the sentence to be imposed as I have stated it.

Mr. Capone, is there a voluntarily waiver of appeal rights of 71 and below?

MR. CAPONE: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Before I notify the defendant of his appeal rights, Mr. Finkel, you wanted to make some requests of the Court.

MR. FINKEL: Please, your Honor. First, your Honor, we'd respectfully request that you permit the defendant to do a self-surrender. With regard to this, I note that the probation department says that he is, I think their language, a very good candidate for self-surrender.

THE COURT: What's the position of the government?

MR. CAPONE: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I'll allow self-surrender.

There's some risk though. I actually don't think it's a risk of flight, but he notified me of a relapse in terms of alcohol.

Mr. Lichtenstein, it's important that you continue on

your path to sobriety. There are going to be some pressures as you get toward the date that you have to surrender yourself, but I am going to give you the ability to surrender voluntarily. Just make sure you continue to follow all of the conditions of your release up to then, including the additional condition of not taking alcoholic beverages.

MR. FINKEL: May I make two additional requests, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

2.3

MR. FINKEL: We'd request that your Honor would recommend to the Bureau of Prisons that Mr. Lichtenstein be assigned to an RDAP alcohol program run by the Bureau of Prisons. We'd also request that your Honor recommend that he be incarcerated in a prison camp, one that has the RDAP program, as close to New York City as possible.

THE COURT: I'll leave it up to the Bureau of Prisons for whether or not he's going to get into the Residential Drug Abuse Program. I don't tell them what designation of facility to use.

For this defendant, I will make the recommendation that he be housed in the tristate area in order to facilitate family visits with his family.

They live in Pomona; is that correct?

MR. FINKEL: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: With his family that lives in Pomona. So

I will make that recommendation.

2.3

Mr. Lichtenstein shall surrender for service of sentence at the institution designated by the Bureau of Prisons on or before 2:00 p.m. of May 5, 2017.

Mr. Lichtenstein, you have the right to appeal the sentence. If you cannot pay the costs of an appeal, you have the right to apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis, which means a lawyer will be appointed to represent you at no cost to you, and you won't have to pay any fees of the appeal as well.

I do wish to inform you, sir, that in your plea agreement, you agreed to waive your right to appeal the sentence, and you agreed to waive your right to collaterally attack the sentence to the extent that I sentenced you to 71 months and below. Indeed, I've sentenced you to less than half of that sentence.

Is there anything else, Mr. Finkel?

MR. FINKEL: No, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Capone?

MR. CAPONE: Your Honor, the government moves to dismiss the open counts as to this defendant.

THE COURT: The motion is granted.

Mr. Lichtenstein, the public just cannot not penalize somebody who betrays the public trust, who corrupts the New York Police Department. You'll serve your sentence. You'll get out. You'll be able to rejoin your community. Thank you.